



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — CONTROL BY STATES — TAXATION: GOODS IN TRANSIT. — The defendant shipped grain from western to eastern points under through bills of lading which allowed warehousing in Chicago for inspection and testing. Illinois taxed the grain in warehouse as his personal property. *Held*, that the tax is constitutional. *Bacon v. People of Illinois*, 227 U. S. 504, 33 Sup. Ct. 299.

This decision seems to show that in taxation, at least, the question of interstate commerce is to be approached from the viewpoint of a reserved power in the states, and that a property tax is constitutional if not levied on the commerce as such and if it does not discriminate against interstate commerce. See 26 HARV. L. REV. 358.

JOINT WRONGDOERS — EFFECT OF RELEASE OF ONE NOT LIABLE FOR THE TORT. — In an action for the death of the plaintiff's intestate due to the defective condition of a sidewalk, for which the defendant was responsible, it appeared that the plaintiff had for consideration released the city from all liability for the injury. The city was not legally liable. *Held*, that this release is a bar to the present action. *Casey v. Auburn Telephone Co.*, 139 N. Y. Supp. 79 (Sup. Ct., App. Div.).

A release under seal at common law, given to one joint wrongdoer, discharges the liability of all, on the ground that each is liable in full and one release is equivalent to actual satisfaction. *Bronson v. Fitzhugh*, 1 Hill (N. Y.) 185; *Stone v. Dickinson*, 89 Mass. 26. Where there is no formal release it becomes a question of fact whether the amount is paid by one wrongdoer as satisfaction in full. *Chicago v. Babcock*, 143 Ill. 358, 32 N. E. 271. If not a complete satisfaction the amount paid is only a *pro tanto* bar to a suit against a joint wrongdoer. *Lovejoy v. Munsy*, 3 Wall. (U. S.) 1; *Ellis v. Esson*, 50 Wis. 138. Where settlement in full is made with one not actually liable, those liable in fact are discharged. *Brewer v. Casey*, 196 Mass. 384, 82 N. E. 45; *Hartigan v. Dickson*, 81 Minn. 284, 83 N. W. 1091. *Contra*, *Wardell v. McConnell*, 25 Neb. 558, 41 N. W. 548. And therefore it is urged that a mere release under seal will have the same effect. *Hubbard v. St. Louis & M. R. Co.*, 173 Mo. 249, 72 S. W. 1073. *Contra*, *Thomas v. Central R. of N. J.*, 194 Pa. St. 511, 45 Atl. 344. It is submitted, however, that a new release of one not liable cannot extinguish a liability which attaches only to another. Of course an injured person should receive but one satisfaction, and the question whether the compromise in the principal case is a complete bar should depend on whether it was actually intended as full satisfaction for the injury.

LIBEL AND SLANDER — ACTS AND WORDS ACTIONABLE — RECOVERY FOR INJURY TO FEELINGS. — The plaintiff sued the defendants who, in accordance with a prior agreement among themselves, shadowed the plaintiff in such a manner that it was apparent to the public that he was the subject of surveillance. The plaintiff proved that he was thereby caused mental anguish and that his reputation was injured. *Held*, that an actionable tort is proved. *Schultz v. Frankfort Marine, Accident, & Plate Glass Ins. Co.*, 139 N. W. 386 (Wis.).

The court reasons that since when represented by picture shadowing would be actionable, *a fortiori* it must be so when actually committed. But this overlooks the different treatment the law has accorded libel and slander. *Thorley v. Lord Kerry*, 4 Taunt. 355. See ODGERS, LIBEL AND SLANDER, 5 ed., 39. If acts of this character are to be treated as defamation they must be regarded as slander because they are temporary in nature and after the act retain no capacity for republication. See TOWNSEND, LIBEL AND SLANDER, 4 ed., § 1; BOWER, CODE OF ACTIONABLE DEFAMATION, 20. The technical rules of slander would not allow recovery since from the opinion it would seem that no special